

### REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 36, 37 and 48 are amended herein.

The specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Claims 50, 54 and 57 were objected to as being duplicative of claims 48, 52 and 55. However, the dependency of claim 48 has been corrected so that it now depends from claim 36 rather than claim 38. This correction also removes the objection to claims 54 and 57.

The two independent claims in the application (claims 1 and 36) as well as dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 37, 39, 40, 42-46, 49 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Deng, *et al.*

Dependent claims 4, 5, 8, 11, 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Deng, *et al.* in view of Hsue, *et al.* The Examiner acknowledged that Deng, *et al.* did not teach the limitations of claim 4 drawn to the chromium pattern being permanently secured to the conductive film. Claims 5, 8, 11, 15 and 19 all depend from claim 4. Hsue, *et al.* was cited by the Examiner as teaching that the conductive film covers all of the front face of the substrate and that the opaque pattern is permanently secured to the conductive film.

However, the two independent claims 1 and 36 have been amended to include a further limitation that the conductive film is deposited so as to be in contact with the opaque pattern. Deng, *et al.* includes a conductive frame 106 that supports the conductive polymer dust pellicle 108 at a fixed distance away from the pattern 102. Thus, Deng, *et al.* teaches away from the deposited conformal conductive coating of the present invention and, consequently, does not even suggest much less teach depositing a transparent conductive film to form a cover that is in contact with an opaque pattern.

Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 36 now patentably define over the Deng, *et al.* reference. Likewise, all of the claims dependent from claims 1 and 36 are also allowable for depending from a claim deemed allowable as well as for their own limitations.

Various claims were objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, these claims have not be rewritten in independent form since it is believed that the independent claims from which they depend are now allowable.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the basis for objections to the specification and claims have been removed. Further, it is believed that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's attorney at the phone number below. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

4 Dec '03  
Date

James C. Kesterson  
James C. Kesterson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 25,882

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218